

Remarks

Claims 1-28 were pending, and claims 1, 5, 6-7, 11, 13, 15-17, 19, 23, and 26-28 have been amended while claims 4, 24, and 25 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Willis (US Pat 6,738,815). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claims 1 and 11 recite, in part, the protocol server bypassing the transaction server by directing communications from the computer directly to the intranet.

Willis fails to disclose these recitations. Willis discloses that the transaction server is utilized when communicating with the legacy and non-legacy systems including the intranet. There is no disclosure that the protocol server can bypass the transaction server to direct communications from the computer to the intranet. Accordingly, Willis fails to disclose all of the elements of claims 1 and 11 such that claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Willis. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-10, and 12-14 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, one or more of these claims recite additional features that are allowable over Willis.

103 Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 7, 14, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Stone (US Pat 6,101,510). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Butts (US Pat 6,233,541). Claims 8, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis in view of Devine (US Pat 6,598,167). Claims 18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis and Stone in further view of Devine. Claims 23-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine in view of Stone. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As with claims 1 and 11, independent claims 15, 23, and 28 also recite the protocol server bypassing the transaction server by directing communications from the computer directly to the intranet.


As discussed above, Willis fails to disclose that the protocol server bypasses the transaction server by directing communications from the computer directly to the intranet. Furthermore, none of Devine, Butts, and Stone discloses a protocol server and a transaction server where the protocol server bypasses the transaction server by directing communications directly to the intranet. For example, in Devine, the intranet bridges the system interface and the legacy systems and that which communicates with the legacy system through the intranet cannot be bypassed when accessing the intranet itself. Therefore, these cited references, singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the elements of claims 15, 23, and 28 such that these claims are allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons. Dependent claims 16-22 and 26-27 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, one or more of claims 16-22 and 26-27 recite additional features that are allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-3, 5-23, and 26-28 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the request for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Date: May 27, 2005

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093